IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl. Misc. No. 40611-M and 40612-M of 2006

DATE OF DECISION : 26.09.2006

Inderjit Singh

.... PETITIONER

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Vikram Batra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

Petitioner Inderjit Singh has filed Crl. Misc. No. 40611-M and 40612-M of 2006 under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of regular bail in two different cases i.e. FIR No. 16 dated 17.1.2003 under Sections 457, 380, 411 IPC and FIR No. 73 dated 27.4.2003 under Section 411 IPC, both registered at Police Station Sirhind.

2. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of both the FIRs and the orders passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, whereby bail applications of the petitioners have been dismissed.

3. The petitioner was facing trial in three different criminal cases pending in the same court and he was on bail. On 7.2.2004, he did not appear before the trial court, due to which his bail bonds were cancelled and he was summoned through non-bailable warrants. Subsequently, the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender on 20.11.2004. Thereafter, he did not appear and was involved in six more criminal cases of similar nature, out of which four cases were registered at Police Station Sector 5, Panchkula and two cases were registered at Police Station Sector 36, Chandigarh. In all these six cases, the petitioner committed offence after jumping bail in three cases already pending trial.

4. Counsel for the petitioner contends that out of the three cases, which are pending trial, in the third case, the petitioner has been granted regular bail by this Court in Crl. Misc. No. 40613-M of 2006 on August 25, 2006. From the perusal of that order, it appears that the fact regarding registration of six other criminal cases against the petitioner at Panchkula and Chandigarh was not brought to the notice of the Court.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and the fact that after jumping bail in three cases, the petitioner has indulged in six more cases of similar nature, I am not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to him.

6. Dismissed.

September 26, 2006 **(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)**
ndj **JUDGE**